



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,659	08/06/2001	Amy L. Sherwood	BS01-001	8201
38823	7590	11/22/2004	EXAMINER	
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP/ BELLSOUTH I.P. CORP 100 GALLERIA PARKWAY SUITE 1750 ATLANTA, GA 30339			CLARK, ISAAC R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	
DATE MAILED: 11/22/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/921,659

Applicant(s)

SHERWOOD, AMY L.

Examiner

Isaac R Clark

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/02/2001</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-34 are presented for examination.

Priority

2. No claim for priority has been made in this application.
3. The effective filing date for the subject matter in the pending claims in this application is 08/06/2001.

Drawings

4. The Examiner contends that the drawings submitted on 08/06/2001 are acceptable for examination proceedings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. As per claim 20, claim 20 recites both an apparatus ("The system of claim 15") and a process step ("saving a configuration of delivery option settings that is associated with a first set of addresses"). A claim reciting both an apparatus and the method steps of using the apparatus is indefinite. See *In Ex parte Lyell*, 17 USPQ2d 1548 (BPAI 1990).

8. Claim 21 is rejected based on its dependency on claim 20.
9. For the purpose of examining claims 20 and 21, claim 20 will be construed as if written "20. The system of claim 15, further comprising means for saving a

Art Unit: 2154

configuration of delivery option settings that is associated with a first set of addresses.”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 1, 2, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson et al. (US Patent 5,694,616) hereinafter Johnston.

12. As per claim 1, Johnson discloses a method for selectively applying a delivery option (Fig. 2; col. 2, lines 5-10; “RP attribute”) to an email comprising the steps of:

(a) listing email addresses (Fig.2, step 220);

(b) selecting a plurality of said email addresses in the course of composing an email message (Fig. 2, step 225);

(c) selectively applying the delivery option to one or more, but not all, of said plurality of email addresses (Fig. 2, step 235, col. 4, lines 4-6); and

(d) sending the email to said plurality of email addresses (Fig. 2, step 240).

Art Unit: 2154

13. As per claim 2, Johnson discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising listing email addresses on a computer screen (col. 3, lines 63-67; Fig. 1, item 30a).

14. As per claims 15 and 16, claims 15 and 16 are apparatus claims which carry out the means described in claims 1 and 2. Johnson describes a computer network system for carrying out the method of claims 1 and 2 (Fig. 1). Claims 15 and 16 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 2.

15. Claims 9, 13, 14, 23, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gupta (US Published Application 2002/0194341).

16. As per claim 23, Gupta discloses a system for selectively applying a delivery option to addressees in an email, comprising: (a) means for displaying an address book (Fig. 5); (b) means for choosing addressees from the address book (Fig. 5, Paragraph 0042); (c) means for setting a flag indicating that more than one addressee has been chosen (Fig. 10, block 1030); (d) means for displaying an email delivery options selection window if said flag is set (Fig. 5, window for selection options; Paragraph 0049, opportunity to review each version may be presented if multiple addressees are given); (e) means for selectively applying delivery options to each of the addressees (Paragraph 0049; each recipient receives a copy of the message formatted to his/her specific settings); and (f) means for sending the email (Paragraph 0069).

17. As per claim 9, claim 9 describes the method carried out by the apparatus of claim 23. Claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 23.

Art Unit: 2154

18. As per claim 27, Gupta discloses the system of claim 23, further comprising means for saving a configuration of delivery option settings that is associated with a first set of addressees (Paragraph 0066; configurations or options associated with a stored list of addresses are retrieved implying that they were previously saved).

19. As per claim 28 Gupta discloses the system of claim 27, further comprising means for matching a second set of addressees with the first set of addresses and automatically setting delivery options saved with respect to the first set of addressees (Paragraphs 0067-0068).

20. As per claims 13 and 14, claims 13 and 14 claim the method carried out by the apparatus described in claims 27 and 28 respectively. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 28 and 27.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. Claims 3 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (US Patent 5,694,616) hereinafter Johnston in view of Shaw et al. (US Patent 6,247,045) hereinafter Shaw.

Art Unit: 2154

23. As per claim 17, Johnson fails to explicitly teach the system of claim 15, further comprising means for sending a separate email for a group of addresses that have the same delivery option configuration.

24. Shaw teaches sending a separate email for groups of addresses that are receiving identical messages (col. 7, lines 1-30).

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Shaw to send a separate email for each group of addressed receiving the same delivery option configuration because they both deal with sending emails to groups of recipients. Furthermore, the teaching of Shaw to generate a single email message for all addresses receiving the same content would allow conserve bandwidth and server resources on the sender's system while still allowing sending messages with a variety of delivery options.

26. As per claim 3, claim 3 describes the method carried out by the apparatus of claim 17. Claim 3 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 17.

27. Claims 4 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (US Patent 5,694,616) hereinafter Johnston in view of Collins et al. (US Published Application 2002/0013817) hereinafter Collins.

28. As per claim 18, Johnson fails to teach the system of claim 15, further comprising means for sending a separate email to each address of said plurality of addresses.

Art Unit: 2154

29. Collins teaches a system for sending emails to a group of recipients wherein a separate copy of the email is generated and sent to each designated recipient (Paragraph 0012).

30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Collins to send separate emails with selected delivery options set to for each email addressee because they both deal with sending emails to multiple addressees.

Furthermore, the teaching of Collins would allow provide enhanced privacy for the recipients by not transmitting their addresses to the other recipients of the email (Collins paragraph 0013).

31. As per claim 4, claim 4 describes the method carried out by the apparatus of claim 18. Claim 4 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 18.

32. Claims 5, 19, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (US Patent 5,694,616) hereinafter Johnston in view of Thorne et al. (US Patent 5,958,005) hereinafter Thorne.

33. As per claim 19, Johnson teaches the system of claim 15 including selectively applying a delivery option to one or more but not all of a plurality of email addresses (Fig. 2, step 235, col. 4, lines 4-6).

34. Johnson fails to teach selectively applying more than one delivery option to less than all of the plurality of email addresses.

35. Thorne teaches selectively applying more than one delivery option to an email address (Abstract; Fig. 3, blocks 304-325; col. 7, lines 6-15).

Art Unit: 2154

36. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Thorne to selectively apply more than one delivery option to one or more of a plurality of email addresses because they both deal with applying delivery options to email addresses. Furthermore, the teaching of Thorne to apply more than one delivery option allows the user to have more control over the handling and delivery of email messages sent to recipients (Thorne, col. 2, lines 47-56).

37. As per claim 5, claim 5 describes the method carried out by the apparatus of claim 19. Claim 5 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 19.

38. As per claim 29, Johnson teaches an email system for selectively applying delivery options to an email having a plurality of addressees, comprising: an email client (Fig. 1, item 30) operable to display an address list (Fig. 2, steps 220) and to select addressees for an email (col. 3, lines 49-51); wherein at least one of the email client and the email server is operable to selectively apply a delivery option to one or more, but not all, of the addressees (Fig. 2, steps 215-225; col. 3, line 64-col. 4, line 8).

39. Johnson fails to explicitly teach an email server in communication with the email client and connected to a network.

40. Thorne teaches a system for applying delivery options to email communications (Abstract; col. 2, lines 45-56) including an email server 112 in communication with an email client 118 and connected to a network 110 (Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 38-56).

Art Unit: 2154

41. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Thorne to provide an email server in the system taught by Johnson because they both deal with applying delivery options to email addresses. Furthermore, the teaching of Thorne to provide an email server in communication with an email client over a network would provide a centralized storage for client mail boxes in an organization unit allowing setting of email policies and protocols on a group basis (Thorne, col. 4, lines 49-61).

42. Claims 6, 7, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (US Patent 5,694,616) hereinafter Johnston in view of Gupta (US Published Application 2002/0194341).

43. As per claim 20 as construed, Johnson fails to teach the system of claim 15, further comprising means for saving a configuration of delivery option settings that is associated with a first set of addresses.

44. Gupta teaches saving delivery options associated with groups of email addresses (Paragraph 0066; configurations or options are retrieved implying that they were previously saved).

45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Gupta to save the configuration of delivery options associated with a first set of addresses because they both deal with sending email messages to groups of addressees. Furthermore, the teaching of Gupta to save the delivery options would make

Art Unit: 2154

them available for retrieval to assign to future emails to the same addressees (Gupta, Paragraph 0067).

46. As per claim 21, Johnson fails to explicitly teach the system of claim 20, further comprising means for matching a second set of addresses with the first set of addresses and automatically setting delivery options saved with respect to the first set of addresses.

47. Gupta teaches matching a second set of addresses with the saved options and automatically setting delivery options based on the saved options (Gupta, Paragraphs 0067-0068).

48. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Gupta to save the configuration of delivery options associated with a first set of addresses and to use the saved configuration to set delivery options on a second set of addresses because they both deal with sending email messages to groups of addressees. Furthermore, the teaching of Gupta to set delivery options based on a saved configuration would allow automatically configuring options for a set of email addresses thus saving time and labor for users (Gupta, Paragraph 0069).

49. As per claims 6 and 7, claims 6 and 7 claim the method carried out by the apparatus described in claims 20 and 21 respectively. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 20 and 21.

50. Claims 8 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (US Patent 5,694,616) hereinafter Johnston in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Art Unit: 2154

51. As per claim 22, Johnson fails to teach the system of claim 15, wherein the delivery option is selected from delivery confirmation and return receipt.

52. The AAPA teaches that systems where in which the user selectively applies delivery confirmation and return receipt options to an email were well known in the art at the time the Applicant made the invention (Background, page 2, Paragraphs 0004-0006).

53. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and AAPA to selectively apply delivery confirmation and return receipt options to one or more of a plurality of email addresses because they each deal with applying delivery options to emails. Furthermore, the teaching of AAPA to apply delivery confirmation and return receipts to emails allow the system to receive email confirmations, allowing the sender to verify that his emails have been received.

54. As per claim 8, claim 8 describes the method carried out by the apparatus of claim 22. Claim 8 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 22.

55. Claims 10 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta as applied to claims 9 and 23 above in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

56. As per claim 24, Johnson fails to teach the system of claim 23, wherein the email delivery options selection window permits selective application of at least one of delivery confirmation and return receipt.

57. The AAPA teaches that systems where in which the user selectively applies delivery confirmation and return receipt options to an email were well

Art Unit: 2154

known in the art at the time the Applicant made the invention (Background, page 2, Paragraphs 0004-0006).

58. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Gupta and AAPA to provide the option to select delivery confirmation or return receipt options from the delivery options selection window because they each deal with applying delivery options to emails. Furthermore, the teaching of AAPA to apply delivery confirmation and return receipts to emails allow the system to receive email confirmations only from those addressees necessary allow the user to receive confirmation that his emails had been received by selected addressees.

59. As per claim 10, claim 10 describes the method carried out by the apparatus of claim 24. Claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 24.

60. Claims 11 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta as applied to claims 9 and 23 above in view of Shaw et al. (US Patent 6,247,045) hereinafter Shaw.

61. As per claim 25, Gupta fails to explicitly teach the system of claim 23, further comprising means for sending a separate email for a group of addresses that have the same delivery option configuration.

62. Shaw teaches sending a separate email for groups of addresses that are receiving identical messages (col. 7, lines 1-30).

63. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Gupta and Shaw to send a separate email for each group of addressed receiving the same delivery option

Art Unit: 2154

configuration because they both deal with sending emails to groups of recipients.

Furthermore, the teaching of Shaw to generate a single email message for all addresses receiving the same content would allow conserve bandwidth and server resources on the sender's system while still allowing sending messages with a variety of delivery options.

64. As per claim 11, claim 11 describes the method carried out by the apparatus of claim 25. Claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 25.

65. Claims 12 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta as applied to claims 9 and 23 above in view of Collins et al. (US Published Application 2002/0013817) hereinafter Collins.

66. As per claim 26, Gupta fails to teach the system of claim 23, further comprising means for sending a separate email to each address of said plurality of addresses.

67. Collins teaches a system for sending emails to a group of recipients wherein a separate copy of the email is generated and sent to each designated recipient (Paragraph 0012).

68. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Gupta and Collins to send separate emails with selected delivery options set to for each email addressee because they both deal with sending emails to multiple addressees.

Furthermore, the teaching of Collins would allow provide enhanced privacy for the recipients by not transmitting their addresses to the other recipients of the email (Collins paragraph 0013).

Art Unit: 2154

69. As per claim 12, claim 12 describes the method carried out by the apparatus of claim 26. Claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 26.

70. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson and Thorne as applied to claims 29 and 23 above in view of Shaw et al. (US Patent 6,247,045) hereinafter Shaw.

71. As per claim 30, Johnson fails to explicitly teach the email system of claim 29, wherein one of the email client and email server sends a separate email for a group of addressees that have the same delivery option configuration.

72. Shaw teaches a system using an email client 104 to send a separate email for groups of addresses that are receiving identical messages (Fig. 1, col. 7, lines 1-30).

73. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Shaw to send a separate email for each group of addressed receiving the same delivery option configuration because they both deal with sending emails to groups of recipients. Furthermore, the teaching of Shaw to generate a single email message for all addresses receiving the same content would allow conserve bandwidth and server resources on the sender's system while still allowing sending messages with a variety of delivery options.

74. Claim 31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson and Thorne as applied to claim 29 in view of Collins et al. (US Published Application 2002/0013817) hereinafter Collins.

Art Unit: 2154

75. As per claim 31, Johnson fails to teach the email system of claim 29, wherein one of the email client and email server generates and sends a separate email to each addressee.

76. Collins teaches a system for sending emails to a group of recipients wherein a separate copy of the email is generated and sent to each designated recipient (Paragraph 0012).

77. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Collins to send separate emails with selected delivery options set to for each email addressee because they both deal with sending emails to multiple addressees.

Furthermore, the teaching of Collins would allow provide enhanced privacy for the recipients by not transmitting their addresses to the other recipients of the email (Collins paragraph 0013).

78. Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson and Thorne as applied to claim 29 in view of Gupta (US Published Application 2002/0194341).

33. The email system of claim 32, wherein one of the email client and email server matches a second set of addressees with the first set of addressees and automatically sets delivery options saved with respect to the first set of addressees.

79. As per claim 32 as construed, Johnson fails to teach the email system of claim 29, wherein one of the email client and email server saves a configuration of delivery option settings that is associated with a first set of addressees.

Art Unit: 2154

80. Gupta teaches saving delivery options associated with groups of email addresses (Paragraph 0066; configurations or options are retrieved implying that they were previously saved).

81. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Gupta to save the configuration of delivery options associated with a first set of addresses because they both deal with sending email messages to groups of addressees. Furthermore, the teaching of Gupta to save the delivery options would make them available for retrieval to assign to future emails to the same addressees (Gupta, Paragraph 0067).

82. As per claim 33, Johnson fails to explicitly teach the email system of claim 32, wherein one of the email client and email server matches a second set of addressees with the first set of addressees and automatically sets delivery options saved with respect to the first set of addressees.

83. Gupta teaches matching a second set of addresses with the saved options and automatically setting delivery options based on the saved options (Gupta, Paragraphs 0067-0068).

84. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Gupta to save the configuration of delivery options associated with a first set of addresses and to use the saved configuration to set delivery options on a second set of addresses because they both deal with sending email messages to groups of addressees. Furthermore, the teaching of Gupta to set delivery options based on

Art Unit: 2154

a saved configuration would allow automatically configuring options for a set of email addresses thus saving time and labor for users (Gupta, Paragraph 0069).

85. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson and Thorne as applied to claim 29 in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

86. As per claim 34, Johnson fails to teach the email system of claim 34, wherein the delivery options comprise delivery confirmation and return receipt.

87. The AAPA teaches that systems where in which the user selectively applies delivery confirmation and return receipt options to an email were well known in the art at the time the Applicant made the invention (Background, page 2, Paragraphs 0004-0006).

88. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and AAPA to selectively apply delivery confirmation and return receipt options to one or more of a plurality of email addresses because they each deal with applying delivery options to emails. Furthermore, the teaching of AAPA to apply delivery confirmation and return receipts to emails allow the system to receive email confirmations, allowing the sender to verify that his emails have been received.

Conclusion

89. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "System and method for selective application of email delivery options".

Art Unit: 2154

- i. Raghunandan 6,775,689 Sending customized content in email to selected recipients.
- ii. Costales et al. 6,044,395 Selected portions of email delivered separately from.
- iii. Nielsen, Jakob 6,108,688 Delivery confirmations for email.
- iv. Henderson et al. 6,185,603 Email incorporating codes which implement various delivery options
- v. Lee et al. 6,212,553 Sending flags and attributes via email

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac R Clark whose telephone number is (571)272-3961. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Irc



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100